8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

1	CHRISTIAN Z. SMITH, ESQ.
	Nevada Bar No. 8266
2	RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM
	801 South Fourth Street
3	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
5	Telephone: (702) 444-4444 Facsimile: (702) 444-4455
	Facsimile: (702) 444-4455
6	Attorney for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JANEY RUTH CICCOLELLA, individually,

Plaintiff,

VS.

SMITH'S FOOD & DRUG CENTERS, INC., a Foreign Corporation; THE KROGER CO., a Foreign Corporation; DOES I - X, and ROE CORPORATIONS I - X, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-01686-APG-NJK

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND DISCOVERY (THIRD REQUEST)

1. The parties can show good cause for the present stipulation.

Previously, counsel stipulated to a 60-day extension to discovery to allow the parties to complete discovery. One of the primary reasons for the prior stipulation was that Plaintiff's prior attorney, Elaine Marzola Esq., had experienced the loss of a family member which delayed discovery. Counsel resumed discovery; however, discovery was placed on hold because the parties agreed to conduct a private mediation with Judge Stewart Bell on March 6, 2019. Due to the scheduled mediation, the parties filed a second request to extend the discovery deadlines by 30-days in hopes that this matter would resolve at mediation. The parties attended the mediation on March 6, 2019; however, a settlement was not reached.

27

28

LAW FIRM

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

After the March 6, 2019 mediation, Ms. Marzola left the Richard Harris Law Firm and Plaintiff's case was transferred within the law firm to Christian Z. Smith, Esq. A Notice of Appearance for Mr. Smith was filed on or about March 15, 2019. Mr. Smith has undertaken efforts to get up to speed on the litigation of this matter.

Mr. Smith and Jerry Busby, Esq, Defendant's counsel, have had discussions about the discovery that needs to be completed which mainly involves obtaining all of Plaintiff's prior medical records. It was agreed that it will take more time to obtain these prior treatment records than previously contemplated because some of these medical providers are out of state. As such, the parties are requesting a 90-day extension.

IT IS HEREBY STIPUALTED AND AGREED by and between CHRISTIAN Z. SMITH, ESQ. of the RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM, Attorneys for Plaintiff, JANEY CICCOLELLA, and JERRY BUSBY, ESQ. of the law firm COOPER LEVENSON, P.A., Attorneys for Defendant, SMITH'S FOOD & DRUG CENTERS, INC. that certain discovery deadlines in this matter be continued for a period of 90 days to all the parties additional time to complete discovery without having to burden the Court with another stipulation to extend in the future.

DISCOVERY COMPLETED TO DATE

- On September 10, 2018, the parties conducted the Rule 26 Conference;
- On September 20, 2018, the parties submitted a Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order for the Court's approval;
- 3. On September 24, 2018, Defendant served written discovery to Plaintiff;
- On November 1, 2018, Plaintiff served written responses to Defendant's discovery;
- On November 6, 2018, Plaintiff served written discovery to Defendant;
- On December 7, 2018, Defendant served written responses to Plaintiff's discovery;
- On January 17, 2019, Defendant took Plaintiff's deposition;

///

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

process of reviewing all the available medical records and are unable to complete their respective evaluation until all or most of Plaintiff's prior treatment records are obtained and produced. DISCOVERY TO BE COMPLETED

- 1. The parties will formally designate initial and rebuttal experts;
- The parties will take depositions of designated expert witnesses and medical providers;

8. The parties have retained medical experts, but those medical experts are still in the

- 3. The parties will take the depositions of any other witnesses garnered through discovery;
- Plaintiff will take the deposition of Defendant's Rule 30(b)(6) witness; and
- Defendant will take the deposition of Plaintiff's husband.

WHY REMAINING DISCOVERY HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED

This Request for an extension of time is not sought for any improper purpose or other purpose of delay. Rather, it is sought by the parties solely for the purpose of allowing enough time to conduct discovery.

As previously disclosed to this Court, Plaintiff is alleging significant injuries and damages. Plaintiff; however, has pre-existing medical conditions that need to be fully evaluated to ascertain the extent, if any, of her alleged injuries. Some of Plaintiff's medical providers are out of state which has delayed the parties' ability to obtain these medical records.

The parties attempted to resolve this matter through private mediation; however, settlement was not reached during mediation. There has been some additional settlement discussions and the parties hope to renew efforts at potential settlement after the necessary discovery has been completed.

• • •

...

Lastly, Plaintiff's prior counsel has left the Richard Harris Law Firm which resulted in her case being transferred to Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has diligently undertaken efforts to become familiar with this litigation but this transition in counsel warrants the requested continuance.

The parties respectfully submit that this constitutes good cause for the extension. The following is a list of the current discovery deadlines and the parties' proposed extended deadlines.

Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
June 3, 2019	September 3, 2019
April 4, 2019	July 5, 2019
April 4, 2019	July 5, 2019
May 6, 2019	August 6, 2019
July 3, 2019	October 3, 2019
August 1, 2019	November 4, 2019
	June 3, 2019 April 4, 2019 April 4, 2019 May 6, 2019 July 3, 2019

This Request for an extension of time is not sought for any improper purpose or other purpose of delay. Rather it is sought by the parties solely for the purpose of allowing enough time to conduct discovery in this case and adequately prepare their respective cases for trial.

This is the third request for extension of time in this matter. The parties submit that the 1 reasons set forth above constitute good cause for the requested extension. 2 3 Respectfully submitted this _26th__ day of March, 2019. 5 RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM COOPER LEVENSON, P.A. 6 7 /s/ Christian Z. Smith, Esq. /s/ Jerry S. Busby, Esq. CHRISTIAN Z. SMITH, ESQ. JERRY S. BUSBY, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 8266 Nevada Bar No. 1107 801 S. Fourth Street 1835 Village Center Circle Las Vegas, NV 89101 Las Vegas, NV 89134 (702) 444-4444 (702) 266-1125 Attorneys for Plaintiff Attorneys for Defendant 11 SMITH'S FOOD & DRUG CENTERS JANEY CICCOLELLA 12 13 IT IS SO ORDERED: 14 NO FURTHER EXTENSIONS WILL BE GRANTED. 15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 16 DATED: March 27, 2019 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27